

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

**Amendments to the Drawings**

None

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

**Remarks**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. In particular the Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the teleconference on March 28, 2007; wherein the Examiner assisted in clarifying the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections.

With regard to the substantive portion of the Written Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected as failing to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, the written description requirement; Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ayd (U.S. 6025989) in view of Sun; Claims 3, 5, 10, and 17 were rejected as unpatentable over Ayd and Sun in view of Savage.

**Response to 112 rejections**

In response to the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 8, and 15 by deleting the "standard" limitation for the "disk drive" in accordance with the Office Action. Additionally, the Applicant has amended the specification; specifically, Paragraph 30 as to further distinguish the Applicant's invention over the cited references and to support current Claim amendments. The Applicant submits the above changes overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 objections. Specifically, by amending the claims to include CPU subsystem housing rather than "housing", the Applicant has sufficiently distinguished the CPU subsystem housing from the "computer housing" referenced in the claims; thereby enabling one skilled in the art to understand the claimed invention. Additionally, because the specification, paragraph 30, previously referred to the CPU subsystem as being enclosed by a housing, the Applicant believes there is no new matter being added to the Application.

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

The Applicant has additionally amended the specification to include thus mechanically coupling the two devices through application of a lateral force into one unit. The Applicant believes this amendment does not constitute new matter as the specification and the figures teach a pair of screws or other members fastening the CPU and disk drive into one unit, the force applied to insert the screws being applied laterally to the orientation of the unit. Accordingly, the Applicant submits no new matter has been submitted.

#### **Response to 103 rejections**

In response to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20; canceled 2-7, 10, and 13-14; and added new Claims 21-29. Support can be found for these new claims and amendments in Figure 1 and paragraph 30. Specifically, support for the manner of coupling the disk drive to the CPU, being mechanically coupled through a lateral force and not including a base member, may be found in Figure 1 and paragraph 30; as the specification and claim amendments are merely describing the components of figure 1 and paragraph 30. Additionally, support for the Applicant invention "not including an internal power supply" is based on no teaching of any internal power supply in the Applicant's application. Accordingly, the Applicant believes there is no new matter.

The Applicant submits the proposed amendments sufficiently overcome the combination of the cited references. Specifically, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include "consisting essentially of"; which limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps "and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

characteristic(s)" of the claimed invention." See MPEP §2111.03. One of the distinct advantages of the Applicant's claimed invention is the systems simplicity, merely consisting essentially of a disk drive, a cpu subsystem with a electrical connector/data bus interface. In contrast, Ayd includes multiple disk drives, a power module, a pair of cooling fans, a complicated coupling mechanism (described in more detail below), and a supervisor card. Because Claim 1 no longer includes comprising, the Applicant submits Ayd no longer is applicable.

Additionally, the Applicant's amended Claims teach the manner in which the CPU system and the disk drive are coupled and/or connected together are distinct from that which is taught in Ayd, or any of the cited references. The Applicant's invention discloses selectably coupling the disk drive and CPU system through a lateral force. Indeed, lateral is defined as "of, relating to, or situated at or on the side". See lateral. Dictionary.com. *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/lateral> (accessed: April 24, 2007). Additionally, in contrast to Ayd, the Applicant's coupling of the disk drive to the CPU is greatly simplified, less complicated, and requires fewer, less complicated components. Specifically, as described in the Applicant's amended claims, the CPU system and disk drive are not coupled and/or connected together through a base support member, or forward extension such as disclosed in Ayd. In contrast to Ayd, the base support member/forward extension is not necessary in the Applicants' invention, as the Applicant's CPU-disk drive system is configured to slide into a standard computer enclosure.

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

In contrast to the Applicant's invention, Ayd teaches a non-removable logic chassis and removable chassis (identified by the Examiner as CPU subsystem and disk drive) are non-laterally coupled, or coupled together from the front (Figures 1 and 3). Further, Ayd teaches a complicated and difficult process of coupling the server into a single structure (figures 1 and 3, col. 3, lines 4-25, col. 4, lines 24-34). First, a user must slide an activation handle 13, slide a removable chassis 14 into the logic chassis 12; fasten a plurality of screws, lower the activation handle 13; mate together all the electrical connectors; and then slide the removable chassis and the logic chassis in to an additional structure 52. Indeed, as shown in Figure 1 of Ayd, if any part or component of the forward extension 34 is bent slightly coupling the unit together is almost impossible. These multiple and complicated components may easily break and/or bend rendering system in Ayd difficult and/or impossible to assembly properly. On the other hand, the Applicant's invention simply requires the standard data bus interface to be connected and the two tabs/ears of the CPU subsystem housing to be secured against the disk and drive.

Additionally, the Applicant has included in Claims 1, 21, and 29 the limitation of not including an internal power supply. The system as taught by the Applicant's invention does not include and/or need an internal power supply as the Applicant's invention is configured to be incorporated into a standard computer housing and/or cabinet. Contrary to this, Ayd does teach the removable chassis/disk drive includes a power supply module 14.

Additionally, the Applicant believes the proposed amended claims overcome and patentably distinguish the Applicants invention from the Sun reference. Specifically, Sun teaches server unit that includes: dual disk drives, room for a extra disk drive, an internal

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

power supply, and an internal cooling fan (see Sun user manual pages 1-5). Indeed, the Applicant's disclosure further distinguishes the present invention from Sun, indicating Sun suffers from a large amount of wasted space, needing an internal power supply and cooling contained in each unit (See Paragraph 8)

#### **Combination of Ayd and Krum not proper**

The Applicant would like to reiterate previous arguments as to the patentability of the Applicant's invention and respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's combination of Ayd and Krum. As previously argued, the Applicant's invention uniquely and advantageously provides for a server system to be incorporated into standard computer disk drive enclosures. The Applicant submits there is not teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine Krum and Ayd. Indeed, both references teach away from the combination. "A reference will teach away if it suggests that the line of development flowing from the reference's disclosure is unlikely to be productive of the result sought by the applicant." *United States v. Adams*, 383 U.S. 39, 52, 148 USPQ 479, 484 (1966). Specifically, Ayd teaches a multiprocessor computer assembled together in a bulky, large cabinet structure or frame 60 (Figures 4 and 6). These are typically used in large corporations, industries where a single, standard disk drive enclosure would not even be contemplated. Indeed, Ayd teaches an assembly so large that a piece of the frame is too heavy and requires multiple person to handle (Col. 4, lines 18-24).

Krum also teaches away from the combination, as Krum is merely an improved method or disk drive mount insertable in a computer housing. Indeed, nowhere in Krum

App. No. 10/081,801  
Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

is there any teaching suggestion, or motivation of combining a CPU processor with the disk drive into a single structure, such as is taught in the Applicant's invention.

**Improper Incorporation of Gai-Cori and Flint references**

Additionally, the Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner improperly incorporated the references of Gai-Cori and Flint arguments in the most previous Office Action (See 8c, page 11 of Office Action mailed October 4, 2006). The Applicant requires clarification, as the Applicant believes these reference were not in previous Office Actions.

**Conclusion**

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 26 2007

App. No. 10/081,801

Attorney Docket No. 3501.2.1 NP

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael W. Starkweather

Registration No. 34,441

Attorney for Applicant

Date: 4/26/07

Michael W. Starkweather  
Advantia Law Group  
Starkweather and Associates  
9035 South 1300 East.  
Suite 200  
Sandy, Utah 84094  
Telephone: 801/272-8368